

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Nancy Campbell
307 Red Hill Road
Gordonsville, VA 22942-6335

September 22, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nancy Campbell



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

elizabeth sharp
100 conselyea
brooklyn, NY 11211-2302

September 22, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?


Sincerely,

Elizabeth sharp



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Warren Winter
3488 Indian Lane
Doraville, GA 30340-2708



September 22, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Warren Winter

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Beverly Smith
Bank Examiner
412 Goucher Blvd
Baltimore, MD 21286-2965

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Beverly A. Smith
Bank Examiner

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

ernst lewis
account executive
1903 cherry drive
east church, VA 22043-1071



September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NBD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
intra-state calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

ernst lewis
account executive

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows.

C. Johnson
Office Manager
07812266900
11223 Joyceton Dr.
Upper Marlboro, MD 20774-1541



September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

C. Johnson
Office Manager
07812266900

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket #6-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Edward Fine
318 South Pl.
Louisville, CO 80027-1648

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.


I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?


Sincerely,

Edward Fine



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

John E. Hoy III
Mister
9704 Monteo Court
Fort Washington, MD 20744-6919



September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

John E. Hoy III
Mister

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

MITCHELL ARNOWITZ
1729 GLASTONBERRY RD
ROCKVILLE, MD 20854-2642

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.


I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

MITCHELL ARNOWITZ



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



William Duffy
2269 Havenridge Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80920-6201

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

William Duffy

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Joyce Schneider
14 Valley Rd
Locust Valley, NY 11560-2603



September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Joyce Schneider

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Michael Marshall
218-05090635
500 E. 8th St.
Omaha, NE 68130-1900



September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
Not File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Michael D. Marshall
218-05090635

Message sent to the following recipients
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Phillip Bender
919 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5503

September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.


I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge
the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers
before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month
regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This
will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the
ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and
was updated to increase the availability of communication services to
schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and
low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and
I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month
regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for
interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on
wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long
distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and
nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize
wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket
income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a
pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits
all" charge for wireless phones?


Sincerely,

Phillip Bender



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Steven Day
9930 S Park Cir
Rural Station, VA 22039-2910



September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
N3D File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Steven Day

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Jane Wise
Manager, Telco Svcs
6340 LBJ Freeway
Dallas, TX 75240-6405



September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Jane M. Wise
Manager, Telco Svcs

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



James West Jr
255
36438 Smith Road
Romulus, MI 48174-4106

September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSI File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.


The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

James West
CSA

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-47 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Sean Murphy
131 Kalorama Rd NW
Washington, DC 20009-5152



September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Sean Murphy

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket #6-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Therese Vaughn
9213 Long Branch Pkwy
Silver Spring, MD 20901-3642

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Therese S. Vaughn

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Susan Schmitt
11616 Eton Manor Drive #301
Cermantown, MD 20876-3955

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Susan Schmitt

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Bill Carpenter
2431 Pioneer Point Rd.
Galena, MO 65656-4956

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NCT File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Bill Carpenter

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Earl Hoisington
17175 Arlington Ct
Manassas, VA 20112-4529

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.


The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Earl Hoisington

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-15 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:



Bernard Virtue
Tax Payer
3131 Courtney Ave
Kingman, AZ 86401-6460

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Bernard Virtue
Tax Payer